STATINTL

MEMORANDUM FOR: Deputy Director of Data Processing

FROM

Deputy Director for Processing

SUBJECT   : SAFE Relation Issues for the ODP Board
                  of Directors

        I believe that there are several SAFE related issues
that the ODP Board of Directors should address. Some of
them are currently being discussed by Processing and SAFE
personnel but the progress towards the resolution of
issues is slow. In truth, the issues are better addressed
at the office level, for they represent direction in ODP
policy, and not technical disagreements.

    Issue #1 - Should CPU's in the SAFE and Ruffing
               Centers be able to direct output to a
               common set of printers?

    Comment - The requirements of both SAFE and systems
               operating in the Ruffing Center call for
               printers located in user locations. It
               seems reasonable that the CPU's in both
               centers should be able to direct output
               to the same printers so that we would never
               need 2 partially used printers sitting side
               by side--one for SAFE and one for Ruffing
               Center systems. The printers in the common
               point would likewise be sharable.

    Issue #2 - Why is there an arbitrary restriction on
               the number of SAFE terminals that can access
               Ruffing Center CPU's?

    Comment - The design of the BUS should allow free
               access from any SAFE terminal to any CPU
               in the Ruffing Center. The design of the
               BUS should treat access to the Ruffing
               Center CPU's no differently than access

SUBJECT: SAFE Relation Issues for the ODP Board of
Directors

to a SAFE CPU. The current design sets
an arbitrary limit on the number of the
terminals that can have access. In the
NFAC Five-Year ADP Plan, they state
"Smooth communications between systems
like CDS, SAFE, ETECS, Genigraphics, and
ODP will be an absolute requirement to
insure the timeliness of the intelligence
product.

Issue #3 - Will the initial design of the BUS allow
for communication between a Delta Data
terminal and a Ruffing Center CPU?

Comment - Everyone agrees that the BUS will replace
the copper wire we have today. But why
isn't [   ] asked to provide a system that
will allow the Delta Data to communicate
with an ODP CPU? It is not sufficient to
say that they will worry about it later.
Design trade offs are best accomplished,
before hardware and software are built,
not afterwards. This issue is too important
to just hope it will work effectively later
on.

Issue #4 - Why shouldn't the new SAFE terminal join
the family of standard ODP equipment?

Comment - The procurement of the new SAFE terminal
gives ODP an opportunity to have a relatively
inexpensive desk top terminal available to
all our customers. The initial design of
the terminal should simply allow it to be
connected to the current ODP network just
like a Delta Data. Users of our systems,
in addition to NFAC may want to use the
new SAFE terminal. In fact, SAFE customers
should be able to access a SAFE CPU via a
Delta Data. If TEMPEST Delta Data's could
be used in out-buildings the new terminal
procurement might not have to worry about
the expense of a TEMPEST SAFE terminal.

SUBJECT: SAFE Relation Issues for the ODP Board
          of Directors

                    The conclusion from Issue #2, 3 and 4,
                    is simply that the initial design of the
                    BUS should allow access from any customer
                    terminal to any ODP CPU.

Issue #5 - Why is there no requirement for a BUS
           network in outbuildings that can communicate
           with the Headquarters BUS?

Comment - The Agency will continually run short of
           space in Headquarters and the number of
           CIA people in outbuildings will only grow.
           The architecture of BUS should allow for
           a BUS in outbuildings with communications to
           the Headquarters BUS.

Issue #6 - What can be done to ease the transition
           of SAFE from a standalone project to one
           that becomes an integral part of ODP.

Comment - Everyone agrees that the SAFE project will
           be folded into the other ODP organizations.
           This transition should be a gradual process.
           It is too big a project and far too important
           for it to be thrown over a wall for someone
           to catch. I would suggest that an appropriate
           set of people from Processing and Applications
           participate in reviewing the formal speci-
           fications that are developed and participating
           in design reviews. They would be there to
           made comments , and not to have any veto
           power. This would go a long way in providing
           a smooth transition into the current non-
           SAFE operating components of ODP.

STATINTL